

| | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/900,760 | KIM ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Bradley L. Sisson | 1634 |

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Bradley L. Sisson.

(3) _____.

(2) Bret Field.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 September 2005

Time: 1630

Type of Interview:

Telephonic

Video Conference

Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: *Draft version of claims with corrected numbering and dependency.*

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

44-70

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Sisson alerted Mr. Field to there being two claims numbered "44." Mr. Sisson noted that while claims could be renumbered in accordance with Rule 1.126, the dependency of the numerous claims would need to be adjusted. Mr. Field authorized an examiner's Amendment whereby the claims, including their dependency, would be corrected as indicated in a draft response provided in an e-mail.